DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 108 EA 019 019

AUTHOR	Tye, Kenneth A., Comp.; Costa, Arthur L., Comp.
TITLE	Better Teaching through Instructional Supervision: Policy and Practice.
INSTITUTION	California School Boards Association, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Mar 86
NOTE	49p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Sales, California School Boards Association, 916 23rd Street, Sacramento, CA 95816 ($6.50).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Policy; Administrator Guides; *Administrator Role; Board of Education Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Education; Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Leadership; Management Development; Peer Teaching; Policy Formation; Supervisory Methods; *Supervisory Training; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Supervision; Training Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Clinical Supervision

ABSTRACT

This monograph guides administrators in developing policies that lead to improved supervision of instruction. Chapter 1, "The Mystery of Effective Teaching," by Barbara Benham Tye, focuses on improving schools' work environment through the supportive methods of clinical supervision. Arthur L. Costa describes five phases of the process between supervisor and teacher in the second chapter, "Clinical Supervision--A Definition." "Reviewing the Difference between Supervision and Evaluation," chapter 3, by Arthur L. Costa and Robert Garmston, distinguishes nine processes in which supervision and evaluation are performed differently. Chapter 4, also by Costa and Garmston, discusses assumptions and goals in "Cognitive Coaching--Supervision for Intelligent Teaching." Michelle Williams relates personal experiences in chapter 5, "Peer Coaching Improved My Teaching," by describing advantages of the model. "The Role of the Principal as Instructional Leader," by Kenneth A. Tye, chapter 6, surveys demands placed upon principals and recommends new types of training programs. The final chapter, "The Role of the School Board: Linking the Professional and Political Worlds of Clinical Supervision," by Richard C. Williams, recommends that teacher supervision involve teachers in procedures; as political bodies, boards must acquaint themselves with teaching procedures as well. A bibliography provides 25 references. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277108

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Better Teaching Through Instructional Supervision:

Policy and Practice

Compiled by
Kenneth A. Tye
and
Arthur L. Costa

2

Better Teaching Through Instructional Supervision: Policy and Practice

Compiled by
Kenneth A. Tye and Arthur L. Costa

Contributing Authors:

Arthur L. Costa, California State University Sacramento
Robert Garmston, California State University, Sacramento
Barbara Benham Tye, Chapman College
Kenneth A. Tye, Chapman College
Michelle Williams, Oxnard Elementary School District
Richard C. Williams, Santa Monica Unified School District and University of California Los Angeles

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: The Mystery of Effective Teaching 2
by Barbara Benham Tye

Chapter 2: Clinical Supervision — A Definition 6
by Arthur L. Costa

Chapter 3: Reviewing the Difference Between Supervision and Evaluation 8
by Arthur L. Costa and Robert Garmston

Chapter 4: Cognitive Coaching — Supervision for Intelligent Teaching 13
by Arthur L. Costa and Robert Garmston

Chapter 5: Peer Coaching Improved My Teaching 18
by Michelle Williams

Chapter 6: The Role of the Principal As Instructional Leader 26
by Kenneth A. Tye

Chapter 7: The Role of the School Board: Linking the Professional and Political Worlds of Clinical Supervision 34
Richard C. Williams

Bibliography 42

Introduction

Under the provisions of California's reform bill, SB 813, California public school boards of education are responsible for adopting policies and determining administrators' competency in "clinical supervision." All over the country, school boards are responding to the national education reform movement by calling for school principals to demonstrate their supervision competency.

That attention is focused upon principals in the supervision process is not surprising; most research points to the critical role played by the principal in providing instructional leadership.

In response to this mandate, training programs in clinical supervision for principals and other administrators have been feverishly mounted by school districts and regional professional administrator association groups. In California, Administrator Training Centers, with healthy State Department of Education funding, have initiated similar programs.

Some of these training efforts are fine. However, a large number miss the mark on several counts. Many simply overestimate what the principal is able to do. Others confuse clinical supervision with evaluation. And almost all view supervision as a top-down process, which overlooks the goal of supervision—to develop and release latent teaching abilities rather than to control or dismiss teachers.

This booklet is written for school board members who are struggling with the task of establishing policies which will lead to improved supervision of instruction and, thus, to better teaching and learning. The description of clinical supervision in these chapters is meant as a guideline for board members as they develop those policies.

Clinical supervision is a helping process. It is not a controlling one. And it is effective. Much of the current education reform rhetoric gives lip service to such concepts as "enabling," "helping," and "developing." However, the reality is that much of what is emerging from the state level is directive, controlling and leading us toward standardization in our schools.

School board members must assert themselves in opposition to these trends. District and school level leadership is still the most important in the educational scheme. This booklet offers guidance for local policymakers to furnish local site administrators with the tools necessary to bring about meaningful improvement through the development and releasing of the talent which resides in those schools.

Chapter 1: The Mystery of Effective Teaching

by Barbara Benham Tye

The links between research and practice in education are notoriously weak. Breakdowns often occur between the publication of research findings and policy decisions intended to implement findings for improved schooling. Some of the so-called "school effectiveness" research is currently being misunderstood and misused in just this way. For example, when the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES) found that children who spend more time engaged with their classwork end up learning more, it was news. Soon, the findings were being interpreted to mean that students should spend more time in school; before long, the state was encouraging school districts to lengthen their school days and years.

Few voices were raised to question the assumptions that were made in the process of converting research findings into education policy. The BTES was conducted at the elementary-school level; would it naturally follow that its findings could be generalized to the secondary level? Careful researchers would be among the first to warn of the danger in such generalization. Yet that is exactly what happened, perhaps because the phrase "time on task" is catchy and memorable, and because it is easier to lengthen the school day than to help teachers do a better job with the time they already have.

Similar distortions are happening in the area of "teaching effectiveness." What makes for excellence in teaching has always been difficult to pin down, impossible to reduce to a formula which then can be mastered by anyone. Study after study has shown that the very best teachers are unique and idiosyncratic, effective — and memorable —because of the particular special blend of skills and knowledge they bring to a classroom situation and the artistic way in which they combine these with elements of their own personality to achieve the charisma that makes students want to do their very best. And a 1979 analysis of the Study of Schooling data bank revealed no significant clues about such "teacher stars." Using extremely high student

satisfaction as the indicator, only about 85 out of 1,016 teachers had students who consistently chose "strongly agree" as their response to such statements as "Students feel good about what happens in this class," and "After class, I usually have a sense of satisfaction." Obviously, a teacher is doing something right when the entire class responds this positively.

However, the data revealed nothing else these 85 teachers had in common. On almost every other indicator, they varied enormously. Some were traditional, some were innovative in their teaching methods. Some were new to the profession, others had many years of teaching experience. There was no evidence to suggest that the "star" was more likely to be of one sex rather than the other. "Stars" were found in every subject area and at all three levels of schooling. Some were strict, others more lenient. That mysterious "something" which made those 85 classrooms extra-special remained a mystery.

The Study of Schooling data did, however, yield some guidelines for effective teaching. As a rule, student satisfaction tended to be high in classrooms where the teacher:

- was clear in giving instructions and explanations;
- consistently told the students what they were going to do and why it was important;
- gave what the students viewed as helpful feedback about how they could correct their mistakes;
- seemed, to the students, to be concerned about them;
- was fair, and did not have favorites;
- was "willing to try different ways of doing things"; and
- "seemed to enjoy being a teacher."

Some of these guidelines are similar to those in the currently popular, but largely cognitive, "clinical teaching" model. Others—specifically, the more effective ones—go beyond that model and suggest a clear connection, in the minds of students, between effective teaching practices and the climate in the classroom. These students were telling us that they believe a teacher is "concerned" and "enthusiastic" when that teacher *cares enough* to be well organized, clear, fair, helpful and consistent. And yet it's not enough simply to master this behavior. Just because a teacher is careful to tell the class, each day, what it is going to be doing, and why, doesn't guarantee an increase in student motivation. Being conscientious about giving corrective feedback is fine, but by itself won't ensure high student satisfaction.

The crucial variable is the overall morale of the staff and their perception of the work environment. The Study of Schooling findings revealed a clear connection between teacher job satisfaction and

student satisfaction with what happens in the classroom; in schools where teacher morale was low, there were far fewer happy, productive classrooms and much more student apathy.

These findings suggest a very different approach to "effectiveness," one which focuses on helping each individual school to improve the work environment for the adults who spend their days there. This involves helping teachers, enabling them to do a better job according to *their own* professional judgment of what that would entail, and empowering them to participate more fully in the decisions pertaining to working conditions in their school. In terms of cost-effectiveness, dollars allocated for teacher inservice, release time for professional growth, and staff development activities are better spent in terms of teacher morale, teaching effectiveness, student satisfaction and, ultimately, student performance, than the same dollars spent lengthening the school year by a few days.

A wise administrator might increase the morale of his or her staff by finding ways to encourage professional interaction among teachers. Most teachers are more or less isolated from each other and from other adults during the working day. Such communication that does take place — in the halls or a teachers' lounge — is generally directed toward immediate, pragmatic concerns: "Who has the 16-mm projector?" "Are you staying for the faculty meeting this afternoon?" and "*Why* do they keep interrupting every class period with P.A. announcements?" There is little time for substantive discussion of professional concerns and even less for visiting other schools or classrooms, observing other programs and other ways of teaching; for learning from each other.

Obviously, it takes a very special kind of leadership to help a school staff overcome its traditions of isolation and begin building a genuine sense of teamwork. The site administrator must have the necessary "people skills" to earn the trust and respect of the staff; should feel really excited at the prospect of working closely with the teachers in a real, not merely a rhetorical, partnership; and has got to be able and willing to share the decision-making process. Equally important is the ability to overcome the adversary mentality created by the labor/management dichotomy, and the ability to serve as a "buffer" for the teachers, creating for them the psychological space needed to unlearn the old habits and to practice the new ones which will make them more effective teachers and the school a more effective school.

Such an administrator would probably make use of clinical supervision as a tool for helping teachers to grow and improve professionally. Without making much of a fuss about it, such a principal might begin by spending more time simply talking with the

staff, being with them, informally as well as formally sharing problems and worries and seeking their ideas about possible solutions. As the trust level builds and sharing starts to flow in both directions, the principal might begin to work with a handful of teachers who want some help with various kinds of classroom problems or who simply want some feedback on their own job performance.

The whole point of clinical supervision is to provide a non-directive but supportive environment in which a teacher feels comfortable enough to admit to having a concern, seek some feedback about that concern from another adult, devise a plan to deal with the concern, and put the plan into effect. Most likely the teacher would ask the colleague to return for additional observations from time to time. After all, part of the reward for a teacher who is trying to improve is having someone around who can recognize that improvement. We all need "strokes," and clinical supervision can be a natural way to give and receive well-earned praise and encouragement.

What I have described is the type of process that the organization development research clearly reveals as the most likely to create a healthy work environment, but this is not what is being promoted in California at the present time. In fact, what we are seeing is quite the contrary: administrators are being trained to follow a certain set of steps in observing a classroom, to take notes in a scripting format, and to discern whether the teacher is (1) demonstrating the components of the "clinical teaching" model, (2) covering the content and skills set forth in the state curriculum specifications, and (3) keeping an orderly classroom. This is being called "clinical supervision," but it actually is the supervision of clinical teaching, which is something else entirely. We ought not to confuse the two by using the term "clinical supervision" interchangeably.

What this all boils down to is actually rather alarming: we don't seem to be providing school people with the support they need to create *truly* "effective" schools, and what we *are* providing seems to be just the sort of thing that may further *erode* teacher morale, job satisfaction, and classroom effectiveness. The type of supervision provided is one critical determinant of whether students see their teachers as being concerned, enthusiastic, and glad to be teaching at that school. We need teachers who feel that way about their work, and it is part of the role of the local school board to see to it that the circumstances of teaching are such that our teachers *will* feel that they have our trust, respect, support, and active help.

Clinical supervision is the method for overcoming teaching problems and attaining a high level of instructional excellence. The site administrator is the key to its success. And the school board provides the leadership by formulating policy to implement it.

Chapter 2: Clinical Supervision — A Definition

by Arthur L. Costa

In 1973, Harvard professor Morris Cogan wrote a book entitled *Clinical Supervision.* The book was the result of more than 15 years of serious study and extended experimentation with the ways in which supervisors could be of most help to teachers. The process described by Cogan and his colleagues is generally accepted today as the most helpful, desirable, and professional approach of any form of supervision yet developed.

While there are variations in the process, generally, it is composed of five distinct phases. They are:

I. The Pre-Conference (before teaching)
II. The Observation (during teaching)
III. The Post-Observation Analysis and Strategy Planning (after teaching)
IV. The Post-Conference
V. The Post Conference Analysis

I. During the Pre-Conference, the supervisor and the teacher meet together. This gives the supervisor an opportunity to:

— understand the teacher's lesson;

— determine what the teacher's goals are, and what instructional strategies are to be employed;

— see how this lesson fits into the overall goals of the curriculum;

— discuss any concerns the teacher has with which he or she would like help;

— determine the methods of collecting and recording data during the observation of the lesson;

— establish the supervisor's role during the observation.

II. Following the pre-conference is the in-classroom Observation phase. The supervisor observes the lesson, collecting data about teacher and student behavior in which the teacher is most interested. The supervisor strives for an objective record, refraining from value judgments or interpretations.

III. After the lesson, the teacher and supervisor allow some time to pass during which both reflect on what has occurred. The teacher reflects on the lesson. He or she anaylzes what happened, compares what actually happened in the lesson with what was intended, and prepares to discuss the lesson with the supervisor.

During this time, the supervisor, too, reflects on the lesson, analyzing the recorded notes and data gathered during the observation. The supervisor also uses the time to plan for the Post-Conference. The supervisor determines a strategy for the conference, based upon the teacher's knowledge of the process of supervision, acquaintance with the lesson topic, skills of teaching, and level of trust between the supervisor and the teacher.

IV. During the Post-Conference, the teacher and supervisor meet once again. The supervisor's intent is to cause the teacher to anaylze the lesson for him or herself. The supervisor's role is to help the teacher examine the data collected, compare this data with the teacher's perceptions of what happened during the lesson, and to help the teacher make prescriptions for changes that will enhance learning.

V. The Post-Conference Analysis is the vehicle for the supervisor and teacher to review the process of supervision, to evaluate what was most and least helpful, and for the participants to gain feedback about their skills — including the supervisor's supervisory skills.

The most important component in this system is an administrator skilled at:

- Communication: Listening, remaining non-judgmental, questioning, and clarifying.
- Observation: Recording accurately and objectively.
- Facilitation: Causing teachers to analyze, prescribe and evalute for themselves.
- Self-evaluation: Inviting feedback from teachers and peers in order to constantly improve these supervisory skills.

Chapter 3: Reviewing the Difference Between Supervision and Evaluation

by Arthur L. Costa
and Robert Garmston

Administrators are responsible for two personal management functions: supervision and evaluation. While these functions are similar in some respects, they are vastly different in others. When they are confused in the minds of administrators and teachers, districts lose much of the value of supervision and evaluation efforts. Distinguishing between these two functions enables teachers, administrators, board members and supervisors to know when, how and for what purposes each process is performed.

I. WHO'S RESPONSIBLE?

Evaluation: By most state laws, only personnel holding an administrative credential may be authorized to evaluate. This responsibility is given by a board of education in a contract and by the state through the training and credentialing process.

Supervision: It is possible to delegate this responsibility to department chairpersons, peers, mentors or colleagues.

II. TIMING

Evaluation: By law, each district must adopt deadlines by which teachers must be evaluated. Tenured teachers are to be evaluated every other year; probationary teachers are to be evaluated yearly.

Supervision: Supervision starts with the first day on the job and continues throughout the year. If a new or veteran teacher is experiencing difficulties meeting a student's particular needs, or with a new subject or grade level or some other problems, it is unwise to wait until March 15th to address those problems. Supervision is ongoing even where there is not a problem.

III. PURPOSES

Evaluation: The purposes of evaluation are broad and comprehensive. They include the need to:

- Meet contractual requirements (such as punctuality, attendance at extra-curricular events, performance of assignments).

- Monitor professional conduct (such as attire, continuing to learn, participation in district staff development, enthusiasm, mental health).
- Certify the effectiveness of instructional practices to the board, staff and community.
- Make commendations for excellence in instructional practices.
- Meet legal requirements determined by board policies and state mandates.
- Apply district-adopted criteria for judging instructional effectiveness.
- Identify instructional deficiencies and plan learning opportunities to remediate those deficiencies.
- Guarantee minimum uniformity of instructional and curriculum procedures.

Supervision: The purposes of supervision, on the other hand, focus primarily on the improvement of instruction. This includes the need to:

- Increase opportunities for students to achieve the goals of the curriculum.
- Refine and improve teaching effectiveness.
- Enhance the classroom climate for learning.
- Improve the organization of curriculum and instruction.
- Align teaching processes and learning activities with learning theory and learners' needs.
- Identify and resolve school and classroom problems that may be hindering learning.
- Identify and remediate students' behavior problems.
- Monitor the sequence, articulation and integration of the curriculum vertically through the grade levels and horizontally across subject areas.
- Enhance instructional diversity.

IV. SOURCES OF CRITERIA

Evaluation: Teaching competencies are usually developed, negotiated, adopted and made public on forms which are used in the evaluation process. While these statements vary from district to district, it is common practice for an evaluator to complete some type of checklist rating of a teacher's performance on such items as classroom control, knowledge of subject matter, room environment, and teaching methods. These criteria are (or should be) made known to teachers at the time of employment so that all personnel are acquainted with the standards of instructional excellence adopted by the board. In evaluation, the criteria are determined by the district.

Supervision: In supervision, on the other hand, the *teacher* determines what the supervisor shall look for as criteria for excellence.

The supervisor asks the teacher to identify those success criteria for which the teacher is striving in a particular lesson. This may be having students perform a certain skill, or it may be some teaching skill the teacher is trying to perfect; questioning techniques and use of wait time are examples. Relationships between the teacher's objectives, degree of attainment, teaching plan and teaching behavior are routinely considered in the supervision dialogue.

V. USES OF THE DATA COLLECTED

Evaluation: As a result of the evaluation process, information written on the district-adopted forms are usually distributed to the teacher and to the district for placement in the employee's personnel file; another copy is retained by the building principal.

Supervision: The data collected is given directly to the teacher. No copies need be kept by the supervisor for other purposes.

VI. TOPICS COVERED

Evaluation: Because the purpose of evaluation encompasses all the provisions of the contract, the topics covered may include such areas as punctuality, willingness to participate in extra-curricular and professional activities, personal characteristics, professional attitudes and growth, and so forth.

Supervision: Because supervision is concerned with the enhancement of learning, the topics covered may include such areas as classroom interaction, instruction, student performance, curriculum adherence, individual student behavior, and teachers' behavior and skills.

VII. VALUE JUDGMENTS

Evaluation: Within the word "evaluation" is the little word, "value." Administrators must rank or rate teachers' performance. Many district evaluation forms include some form of rating scale: Outstanding, Adequate, or Needs to Improve. The task of evaluation includes making such reasoned value judgements on the form about the teacher's performance of a specified skill.

Supervision: If the supervisor makes value judgments, it robs the teacher of becoming self-evaluative. This is contrary to one of the fundamental goals of supervision — to develop teacher autonomy. In supervision, the administrator avoids making value judgments and invites the teacher to evaluate his or her own performance according to the criteria that were set out in the pre-conference.

VIII. THE ROLE OF THE OBSERVER

Evaluation: The observer knows what to look for before entering the classroom. It is desirable that evaluators be trained in techniques

of observing classroom instruction so that they can detect indicators of excellence or inadequacies in the specified performance criteria. Teachers should also be trained in those performance criteria. They should know ahead of time what the evaluator will be looking for, when the evaluation is to take place, and the steps of the evaluation process.

Supervision: The teacher informs the supervisor of what to look for and what feedback information would be desired and helpful. The teacher may ask the supervisor to observe particular students so as to solve some particular learning or behavior problems; or the teacher may ask to have the supervisor observe some particular instructional technique the teacher is trying to perfect. In supervision, the role of the supervisor is determined by the teacher.

IX. EMPOWERMENT

Evaluation: The power to evaluate is bestowed upon the administrator by the board of trustees and the state. It is a line-staff authority position.

Supervision: The power to supervise is bestowed by the teacher. Teachers allow themselves to be supervised because they respect the helpfulness and the leadership qualities of the administrator. At one time, school districts employed "supervisors" who provided direct assistance to teachers. Their jobs were not evaluative. Mentor teachers are beginning to fill this role in California schools again. Potentially, this could leave the administrator free to only evaluate.

Many school districts (Charlotte-Mecklenberg School District in Charlotte, North Carolina is an example) realize that the administrator as an instructional leader lives with the staff daily, is responsible for improving the curriculum and instructional program of the school, and is responsible for creating a school climate that is conducive to learning. This requires a condition of *trust* where teachers are involved in decision making, where problems are solved cooperatively, and where teachers feel free to take risks. The evaluative role may, indeed, repress such an intellectually stimulating environment for teachers. In Charlotte-Mecklenberg, principals supervise only. The district employs a team of trained evaluators to visit schools and rate teachers annually.

Can the administrator play both roles of evaluator and supervisor? Some recent research by Carl Glickman of the University of Georgia provides some guidelines. Initially, Glickman assumed these two roles were in conflict. Results of interviews with teachers, however, proved his assumption to be wrong. He found that the administrator *can* perform both roles under three conditions:

- A trusting relationship must be established between the administrator and the teacher.
- The teacher must know which of the two functions is being

performed —supervision or evaluation.

- The administrator's behavior must be consistent with each of the functions — they should not be mixed.

Lack of distinction between these two functions can cause confusion, suspicion and even hostility. By studying the differences illuminated in this chapter, a distinction will be made and potential problems avoided.

Chapter 4: Cognitive Coaching — Supervision for Intelligent Teaching

by Arthur L. Costa
and Robert Garmston

This is Linda Foley's fourth year teaching primary grades. Successful in preceding years, this October her principal noted that Linda's teaching was lackluster and boringly repetitious. Linda bolted from committee meetings and other teachers resented her absence. The principal decided to act.

Within eight weeks dramatic improvements were noted: Her lessons became interesting, more hands-on learning activities were provided and student attentiveness and work began to improve. She also coordinated the work of a committee developing a handbook for substitute teachers.

Alfonso Martinez teaches high school biology. Last fall he described many of his students as disrespectful and undisciplined. He wanted the vice-principal to come down hard on students he sent to the office. The vice-principal realized that Alfonso needed better classroom management. Alfonso believed the problem to be the low quality of students he taught and he became evasive and defensive in reacting to the vice-principal's gentle suggestions. About six weeks later, Alfonso began asking for classroom management ideas and inviting the vice-principal to observe and coach him as he experimented with some new strategies.

What is the common element in these two examples? For both, the supervisor skillfully employed strategies of *cognitive coaching* to develop trust, reduce fears of evaluation, place responsibility with the teacher, set clear standards and provide assistance.

Unusual stories? Not at all. Similar results are achieved regularly when principals, mentors, department heads and other supervisors employ strategies of cognitive coaching. The supervisor's work, of course, is not complete with either Linda or Alfonso. Both supervisors have "miles to go before they sleep" and many other goals to meet with these two teachers.

What is cognitive coaching? It is simply supervisory strategies that focus on teacher *thinking*. The perceptions teachers have and the

decisions they make before a lesson, during teaching and after a lesson are the source of their instructional behavior.

Some models of supervision focus on installing or eliminating certain specific teaching behavior. In these models, supervisors are taught to identify, coach, and reinforce instructional behavior associated with higher achievement in basic skills. Supervisors learn conferencing techniques to help redirect teachers toward greater use of this specific behavior.

Contrast this focus with three important findings that have been revealed in current research. First, teaching is a highly intellectual process and teachers who are cognitively advanced produce students who achieve well academically and socially. Second, while many adults continue to grow intellectually, many studies show that, in the environment of schooling as it currently exists, such growth is difficult for teachers. Experienced teachers, however, prefer and would respond positively to an environment in which supervisory and inservice approaches appeal to their rationality — their intellect.

Many administrators and teachers reflect growing discomfort with supervisory practices that have become routinized, that reward uniformity, and that are more evaluative than supervisory. Cognitive coaching restores intellectual stimulation to teaching and supervision. It is intended to expand teachers' repertoires and to enhance their capacity for self-supervision and self-evaluation.

Cognitive coaching is based upon four major assumptions:

- All behavior is governed by a person's inner thought processes and perceptions;
- Teaching is an intellectual process involving a continual stream of decisions teachers make prior to, during, and after instruction;
- Learning to understand and skillfully perform a new behavior involves a rearrangement, alteration, or installation of prerequisite mental processes;
- High quality supervision is, therefore, a process of facilitating this rearrangement and alteration of a teacher's inner thoughts and perceptions of the world. These processes are prerequisite to the improvement of teaching behavior.

All of this may sound more complex than it is in actual practice. Think about outstanding administrators you know. The *supervision* they do is probably organized around three major goals: 1) creating and managing *trust*, in order to 2) facilitate teaching *learning*, and 3) to develop teacher *autonomy*.

GOAL I: CREATING AND MANAGING A TRUSTING RELATIONSHIP

There should be, with each successive supervisory interaction, a

greater feeling of mutual trust between the individuals involved in the process. Trust is a basic condition which must be created, nurtured, and maintained in order for the other two goals — learning and autonomy — to be achieved. A primary task for the supervisor, therefore, is to manage the climate of trust. To do this, effective supervisors:

- View their relationship with teachers as long-term — two, three, or more years. They know that growth is incremental and gradual. They realize that no one needs to be "fixed," or changed or transformed in *this* semester or even *this* year.
- Maintain a steady focus on the goals of trust, learning, and autonomy. They recognize that each supervisory interaction should be used as an opportunity to support progress toward these goals. Linda's principal, for example, had these goals in mind as she explored ways to help Linda improve student learning in her classroom.
- Read signals that reflect teacher's unconscious thinking processes. Posture, breathing, gesture, voice tone, and language are some of these. Skillful supervisors maintain rapport by knowing how and when to match these signals with their own behavior. They also reduce stress by making very clear distinctions between their *evaluation* role with teachers and their duties in *supervision.*
- Build trust through listening actively with precision and empathy. Such skills include: paraphrasing, clarifying, providing non-judgmental and objective feedback, and using silence. This was the first step taken by Linda's and Alfonso's supervisors. Additionally, these supervisors skillfully help teachers gain access to their own inner resources: confidence, knowledge, empathy and personal self-esteem. Until recently, most of these skills have been performed intuitively by some exceptional supervisors. Now we are explicitly teaching supervisors to do this.

GOAL II: FACILITATING LEARNING

As a result of every supervisory conference, both the supervisor and the teacher should learn something: about themselves, each other, the students, the content of the lesson, their own belief systems and educational philosophies and the supervision process itself.

In cognitive coaching, supervision for learning includes helping teachers think about their thinking so they will make increasingly effective decisions.

Effective supervisors first formulate clear images of the long-range results of the supervisory relationship, including these intellectual functions basic to effective instruction: planning, goal-directed teaching, self-analysis, and learning from experience. Next, the

supervisor may envision a short-range outcome; a well-managed class for example, in working with Alfonso. Next, the supervisor gets the teacher to identify specific elements of the teacher's view of desired classroom performance. For Alfonso, the vice-principal elicited specific descriptions of desired student behavior. Linda's principal engaged her in developing indicators of primary children's enthusiasm for learning.

Several exacting criteria must be met for an effective, sharply focused outcome. These include one subtle but profoundly influential criterion: that the outcome the supervisor plans must preserve and enhance the positive intentions of the teacher's present behavior. When this condition is not met, the teacher will persist in unconsciously sabotaging the very changes that are desired. Alfonso, for example, wanted to be a teacher, not a "traffic cop." Alfonso's image of a teacher included being a friend, a counselor, and a stimulator of ideas. His vice-principal helped Alfonso bring this to conscious awareness and to devise ways he could manage classroom behavior while simultaneously behaving as the teacher he perceived himself to be. Thus, the supervisor helps the teacher explore and select that behavior which will be more effective and is still congruent with the teacher's original positive intentions. Alfonso's learning in this situation will be used many times again in his career.

Fundamental to cognitive coaching is the supervisor's use of questions to clarify, to stimulate thinking, and to form new understandings. Skillful coaches know a lot about each individual teacher. They use this knowledge of the teacher's preferences, patterns of decision making, and styles of learning to expand the teacher's range and repertoire of choices and teaching strategies.

Another coaching skill which facilitates teacher learning is the application of linguistic tools to help the teacher clarify limitations and illogical assumptions in their own thinking. Effective supervisors do this by judiciously and gently challenging vague teacher statements, such as those in the box on page 17.

GOAL III: DEVELOPING AUTONOMY

As a result of supervisory efforts, the teacher should in time become more self-supervising; more autonomous. This means that teachers will be performing the inner thought processes of supervision themselves —voluntarily and spontaneously without the need for a supervisor's intervention.

Some supervisory behavior that promotes autonomy include engaging in discussions that cause the teacher to become aware of and to monitor his or her own speech and motor skills, belief systems, values, teaching strategies, decision making, and problem-solving

How a Supervisor Helps a Teacher Clarify Thoughts

Teacher:	*"They are to BEHAVE ..."*
Supervisor:	*"Behave how, specifically?"*
Teacher:	*"The STUDENTS are just not getting their assignments done."*
Supervisor:	*"Which students, specifically?*
Teacher:	*"I CAN'T ...*
Supervisor:	*"What's stopping you ... "*
Teacher:	*"Sometimes when students misbehave, I don't know what to do."*
Supervisor:	*"What do you think of first when you're successful at figuring out a situation like this?"*

behavior.

Supervisors also promote teachers' autonomy by helping them become aware of and compare their belief systems with those of other teachers, with different curricula, and with a variety of instructional strategies.

At this time in the history of the education profession there is probably a greater proportion than ever before of teachers who have had fifteen to twenty-five years of experience and who have achieved higher degrees and advanced credentials. Most of them are mature, rational, highly intelligent and dedicated professionals. A suitable process of supervision would appeal to, capitalize upon, and enhance their cognitive processes.

Currently, the act of teaching is being treated as a constant stream of decisions. Any teacher behavior is the result of a decision, either conscious or unconscious. Teachers make an infinite number of decisions daily — as many as 1,300 by some estimates. A supervisory process, therefore, should help teachers make better decisions about instruction. Schools can thereby become places that are growth-producing and intellectually stimulating for teachers as well as for students. Supervisors using cognitive coaching report a sense of adventure and awe both for themselves and for teachers as the satisfaction that attracted them to this profession in the first place is reawakened: helping another person learn.

Chapter 5: Peer Coaching Improved My Teaching

by Michelle Williams

One day while shopping in a children's book store, I saw a poster advertising Lizbeth Zwergerer's adaptation of *Little Red Riding Hood.* The luminous water color drawing of Little Red Riding Hood with the wolf peering over her shoulder had the caption: "Be careful little girl, there's a big bad wolf out there!" The image so delighted me that I have applied it as a metaphor for many life experiences. Sometimes I have applied it to teacher evaluation because, unfortunately, teachers often think of evaluation as "the big bad wolf" peering over one's shoulder while he or she goes about the job of teaching.

But there is an alternative: clinical supervision and peer-coaching can be an effective way to ease teachers' fears over the "big bad wolf" of evaluation.

Although the administrators in my district have used clinical supervision in teacher evaluation for several years, the district recently encouraged teachers to participate voluntarily in a peer-coaching program designed to implement instructional improvement. Qualified teacher trainers organized teams of three or four teachers at several school sites, offered them clinical supervision training, and then arranged opportunities for them to present lessons, observe, and conduct conferences with each other throughout the year. The trainer remained an integral member of the team, presenting lessons, offering structured feedback and guiding the participants through the supervision process. The members of my peer-coaching team (a trainer, two teachers, and a learning director) each presented four lessons, wrote anecdotal records on classroom observations, and took turns conducting conferences. Peer-coaching was a valuable method of improving my teaching.

Experiencing Peer-Coaching

At first I felt flattered when the principal recommended that I be part of our district's clinical supervision training last year. He had only asked four of us to participate and I respected the other three as

thoughtful, experienced teachers. Then, some unavoidable fears crept in whenever I heard about the peer-coaching part of clinical supervision. My apprehension came from two sources: my insecurity over collegial observations and my concern over my students' reactions to frequent schedule interruptions.

Although I felt confident in my teaching, I still did not feel entirely comfortable opening up my class to colleagues who would observe and critique my lessons. A colleague's visit is often more threatening than a supervisor's observation. I had always assumed that a supervisor would keep confidential his or her observations of my teaching, but I wondered if a colleague might discuss my teaching practices with other teachers. Because I had never been observed by a peer-coaching team before, I did not know if I could trust members to be supportive of my efforts.

Actually, my concerns stemmed from the novelty of peer-coaching in our district. As a member of the first group in my school to participate in the program, I had no one to turn to for reassurance that I could trust my colleagues in the peer-coaching relationship and that my classroom would not fall apart because of schedule changes and small groups of observers.

Pre-Coaching Training Cycle

For no particular reason except that I thought it might improve my teaching, I decided to put my concerns aside and join the peer-coaching team.

What happened next, I think, was crucial to the program's success. I was released from my classroom to attend four days of pre-coaching training. Coaching requires a background in educational theory, a common language, a special knowledge of lesson design, and the development of observation and conferencing skills. The pre-coaching cycle introduced current educational research and provided a conceptual base in clinical supervision. Skilled trainers modeled effective teaching methods and taught us techniques of providing structured feedback on lesson observations. We spent the last two days of the training presenting lessons, practicing observation skills, and conducting conferences with each other.

Although I understood terms such as motivation, reinforcement and transfer, reviewing the basic vocabulary of effective teaching enabled me to more readily analyze lessons and communicate specific information to the other participants. Because it is important to analyze lessons quickly, the common vocabulary also facilitated labeling parts of each lesson observation and describing critical elements in anecdotal records.

For several years, my district has valued lesson design as an

integral part of supervision. Supervisors regularly used the five-step lesson plan in evaluating teachers. In fact, this lesson design was so familiar to district teachers that it had become a cliché frequently discussed in the teachers' lounge. I developed, though, a new respect for this five-step lesson plan as it was implemented in the peer-coaching situation. As an observer of fellow teachers, I realized it was important to have a specific format to guide me through a lesson so that I could more easily find the lesson's critical elements. The idea of teaching to one objective also gained more importance; as did the steps of modeling and closure. Though not all lessons fit the entire design, the better lessons followed a clear sequence of these steps.

Improving observation skills by learning to make an anecdotal record was a valuable but difficult part of the training. In order to record all the teacher and student statements during the lesson, I had to pay close attention and use a quick, abbreviated form of writing that was sometimes difficult to read afterwards.

Each of us appreciated hearing specific feedback during the conference and, often, actual quotes from the anecdotal records gave us clearer information about the lesson than a general comment would have done. One teacher in my peer group became aware of an effective part of her lesson during the conference when one of us asked her this question: "What do you think you did in the lesson to prompt Jose to say, 'I know! If I put this number here and this one there, I'll get the same answer!' " As with any skill, thoroughly recording our observations improved with practice so most of us found that our observation skills improved with each lesson.

Next, we began to plan conferences. For each conference two or three members of the team observed, analyzed, and conducted a conference for the fourth member. We reviewed the points discussed in the pre-observation conference, decided on the critical elements of the lesson, and negotiated until we agreed on a conference plan. Some of us approached the conference by choosing the obvious elements to discuss: Did the teacher use all parts of the five-step lesson plan? How was the feeling tone in the classroom? In what ways did the teacher use motivation and reinforcement?

At times we had long discussions about the critical elements of a certain lesson. These sessions were such a luxury because teachers seldom get the opportunity to compare their thinking on educational issues. Through this process we became closer as colleagues while clarifying our own theories and developing many new ideas.

The last part of the pre-coaching training cycle, learning how to conduct conferences, was valuable in that it put me in the role usually held by a supervisor. Because I had not been on the supervisory side of

a conference before, I wondered how I could give specific feedback on a lesson without making evaluative comments that might offend the teacher. I soon discovered that the other participants shared the same insecurity about giving and receiving feedback. This made us very sensitive to each other and we worked out ways to present our statements as feedback — not as evaluation.

I found the conferences to be rewarding because the positive comments we gave each other on the lessons created a warm atmosphere and strengthened us. The suggestions for improvement in the lesson were made in a non-threatening way, usually couched in a question format: "What would you do if you were going to teach this lesson again?" or "What kind of a lesson will you use for a follow-up to this one?" Often the conferences ended with brainstorming sessions where we shared wonderful ideas for expanding the lessons and laid plans for follow-up activity. To my surprise, I found that critiquing a lesson could be a positive experience.

A Peer-Coaching Lesson Observation and Conference

After the pre-coaching cycle, my peer-coaching team met on four occasions during the year. During each session, we followed the same format. We held pre-observation conferences, presented lessons, recorded observations, planned and conducted conferences. Let me demonstrate how a peer-coaching team works together to analyze a lesson and conduct a conference that results in improved instruction:

The E.S.L. teacher on our team was conducting a rather difficult oral language lesson with a small group of limited English-speaking students.

Reviewing the use of contractions in sample sentences was the subject of this lesson. It began with pairs of students orally practicing sentences after the teacher modeled each one for them. About halfway through the lesson something happened and the students became confused. They began giving incorrect responses and lost interest in continuing the practice. Finally, the bell rang and the students walked out the door leaving the lesson unfinished.

In planning the conference, we decided to mention three positive teaching strategies we observed and then try to discover why the lesson changed direction in the middle and ended without any real definition. Glancing over the yellow legal pad of anecdotal notes, we easily found at least three areas where the teacher had used the effective teaching techniques she had previewed for us in the pre-observation conference. The sample sentences she modeled for the children were especially interesting to the class because they described action-filled magazine pictures she showed them. She encouraged them to practice the sentences many times, and offered

positive support statements throughout the entire lesson.

Our notes revealed, however, that she had introduced new learning — a new pronoun and contraction — into the review lesson without direct instruction. Because she had not previously taught this part of the lesson, the students were confused by the shift and the lesson lost its focus.

Because the lesson presenter was an experienced teacher, we planned a facilitating conference where she would analyze the lesson herself. We, as observers, would offer our ideas and the trainer would add structure when needed.

The teacher immediately expressed her feelings about the lesson when she opened the conference by saying, "Boy, I really blew it!" At that point we quickly assured her we had observed many positive parts of the lesson and then addressed her concerns. By reviewing the basic steps of her lesson design, clarifying the objective, and delineating the difference between review and new learning, we all concluded that the lesson changed its course because the teacher had inserted some new material into a review lesson without directly teaching it or modeling it first.

The teacher accepted both the positive comments and suggestions on the lesson. The conference ended with a discussion about various ways to teach parts of speech in a sequential manner and how to review a few parts at a time so that students could build on prior learning. Based on the discussion, the teacher stated a more sequential plan for teaching pronouns that she intended to use the next day. The teacher-trainer volunteered to teach an oral language lesson for the next observation so that we could work out our ideas, and all of us came away from the conference feeling better prepared to teach that kind of a lesson in the future.

Advantages of Peer-Coaching

It is always gratifying to discover that one's feelings, based on personal experience, are supported by researchers. I was interested to find that both David Berliner's research and that of Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers have described how effective peer-coaching is in implementing instructional improvement. Berliner found, from his own experience in helping teachers as director of California's Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, that nothing significant happens in instructional change until the teacher states what he or she is going to do and then someone monitors and helps the teacher look at the effects.

The peer-coaching model causes change in much the way Berliner describes. Teachers work together formally as a group four to six times during school year. Usually a teacher specifies an area of desired

change, often a commitment to use a new practice or change an old one, in the first conference; subsequent conferences can then be structured to monitor that change. This consistent monitoring, coupled with the support of the peer group, leads to improvement in the participating teacher's instruction.

The research done by Joyce and Showers found that an entire school district can implement instructional improvement by identifying the desired innovation, apprising the teachers of all the facets of the instructional method, and then monitoring the implementation through the peer-coaching model.

Through peer-coaching I have improved my own teaching in much the same way Joyce and Showers describe. The instructional area I needed to work on is lesson design. Because I like to integrate art and music into the content areas, I tend to include too much new material in one lesson and sometimes the instruction gets lost in a multi-media melee. Now I have learned to clarify the lesson objective and tailor the materials and activities to that plan. For me, the feedback from my peers helped me fine-tune my teaching style.

Not only have I made improvements in my teaching during the last two years, but I have seen other teachers make instructional changes, also. Using the clinical supervision model with support from the peer-group, they have learned to engage students more directly in the lesson, separate review learning from new learning and teach a five-step lesson plan with perfection. I have seen beginning teachers develop effective teaching strategies and I have seen experienced teachers become energized to create new ideas and revive their previous enthusiasm for teaching.

An important side effect of this whole experience, and one that pleases busy teachers, is that lesson planning becomes much easier and faster by using the peer-coaching model. I've learned to go through the task analysis procedure and get to the core of learning quite quickly so that writing an objective and fitting the activities to that objective become a natural process.

Although acquiring a more thorough knowledge of lesson design and developing new teaching techniques are important to me, the team-building and companionship that I felt in peer-coaching is one of the most satisfying experiences I have had as a teacher. Peer-coaching allows participants time to share common frustrations, learn with each other, and develop mutual respect. Peer-coaching offers teachers an opportunity to grow in their profession.

Will Teachers Resist the Peer-Coaching Model?

If peer-coaching participants and educational researchers agree that this model develops collegial relationships among teachers and,

in turn, facilitates school improvement, will teachers easily and enthusiastically embrace this education innovation? Using my own experience as a guide, I will answer with a tenative "no." The reasons for my scepticism lie partly in the way schools have been traditionally organized and in how the teachers feel about the kinds of changes inherent in the clinical supervision model.

Because there is no precedent for teachers to work together in a collegial relationship it could be difficult to implement a model like peer-coaching in a typical teaching situation. Teachers have traditionally worked alone in a classroom with their students, quietly sheltered from the outside world. The structure of the school building and of the typical teaching day allow for little time to share ideas and develop peer relationships.

Allaying teachers' fears about the program, implementing peer-coaching in a way that invites teachers' ownership of the program and creating a core of volunteers experienced in the advantages of the program are necessary steps to encourage teachers to embrace it and ensure the success of the program.

This year, in addition to participating in peer-coaching, I served as a mentor teacher. At first, I felt teachers' reluctance to participate in either program, but later I saw this resistance soften as we worked to develop more trusting relationships with each other. The number of peer-coaching teams at my school grew from one to four and, by the end of the year, I had worked with more than one hundred teachers as a mentor. I am hopeful that if teachers can be trained by a credible person, a respected peer, they will become convinced of a program's effectiveness and make a commitment to it.

Advantages of a Pre-Observation Conference

The pre-observation step in clinical supervision is usually a short meeting prior to the lesson presentation/observation. The teacher who is to be observed explains what he or she hopes to accomplish in the lesson. The other members of the peer-coaching team then have an opportunity to offer last-minute suggestions or ask questions to clarify the parts of the lesson they will observe.

When a coaching team previews another teacher's lesson prior to the day's observations, the pre-observation conference contributes to the lesson's success in two ways: by making the objective clear through anticipating what will happen in the lesson and by developing a partnership so that each member of the team shared a sense of responsibility and felt ownership for the lesson plan. The development of this partnership created an atmosphere conducive to the teacher's higher performance.

During a recent pre-observation conference, for example, my

coaching team transformed quite a good lesson of mine into a much better one. As I was describing the lesson with them, I realized that the objective I had chosen was not clear. After I narrowed the objective, I chose activities that fit the more manageable objective. During the brainstorming session which followed, I realized that I could quickly prepare a set of manipulative materials to add interest to the lesson. Finally, the teacher-trainer suggested an independent practice idea for homework based on the guided practice that I knew would delight the class and cement the lesson. The pre-observation conference and material preparation took about 10 minutes, but the change in the lesson was dramatic. The successful techniques I used that day will be a part of my repertoire and transfer into other lessons.

Non-teachers as Members of Peer-Coaching Teams

Something special happens in the area of supervision when the school site administrator joins a peer-coaching team. In my district, a few principals and learning directors temporarily put aside their evaluator roles and took a more collegial position as members of a peer-coaching team. On this team they must teach lessons, often to unfamiliar groups of students, and allow themselves to be vulnerable to all the surprises such an experience can hold. They must share their observation feedback as a peer and, with other teachers, jointly plan conferences. Often, this means they relinquish their familiar role as conference director.

I have observed that in schools where school-site administrators are involved in peer-coaching, there is much more interest in the model and teacher morale is high. Both administrators and teachers value this experience, saying that they develop more empathy for each other's positions. Administrators say peer-coaching has sharpened their teaching skills and improved the quality of their suggestions in teacher evaluation. All participants appreciate the atmosphere of sharing and mutual respect created in these schools because of the unique peer-coaching situation.

The quality of instruction is the responsibility of many people. School board members, administrators and teachers need to become acquainted with and appreciate the power of clinical supervision. They need to examine this approach as an alternative to more hierarchical evaluation. In doing so, I think they will find that this model and peer counseling will improve the quality of teaching and develop collegial relationships. Teachers will no longer feel the "big bad wolf" of evaluation is peering over their shoulders and they will realize that evaluation alone doesn't improve teaching.

Chapter 6: The Role of The Principal As Instructional Leader

by Kenneth A. Tye

In almost all of today's literature on school reform, one can find the axiom that the principal is key to the process. Additionally, the literature abounds with prescriptions about how to make principals more effective as instructional leaders. These prescriptions may include making principals more accountable, training them in particular procedures, providing them with additional resources at their schools.

The fact is that there are no simple prescriptions. Principals are as different one from the other as are teachers or any other group of people. They have differing styles, dispositions and abilities. Some of these differences can be altered through training; some probably cannot. More importantly, each school situation is different. Community expectations, student needs, teaching abilities, and available resources, to mention only a few variables, vary widely from school to school. Attempts to standardize principal leadership behavior across all schools will have the same deliterious effects on schooling as the current efforts to standardize curriculum will have: initiative and creativity will be curbed; focus will be upon the wrong ends (e.g. test scores instead of a process of life-long learning); the exercise of power will replace leadership based upon legitimacy, competence and facilitation.

If, on the one hand, principals are the key to the process of school improvement, and if, on the other hand, they are unique individuals operating in unique settings, how can we define the role they should play in the supervision of instruction in their schools?

Seeking at least a partial answer to that question, I turned to two sources. First, I examined six actual job descriptions from a number of California school districts and compared them to the model job description in the National School Boards Association's *School Personnel Management System*. Second, I examined some of the recent research on principals as instructional leaders. These

examinations are only partially illuminating.

The job descriptions ranged from very general to very specific, listing anywhere from 18 to 80 responsibilities. In general, all the job descriptions begin the list of responsibilities with instructional matters — e.g., determining the goals of instruction, conducting visitations and evaluating objectives.

Other related curricular and staff development responsibilities are also listed in all job descriptions — e.g., enforcing the curriculum and its effectiveness, demonstrating knowledge of curriculum support services available from other agencies, providing inservice growth opportunities for teaching personnel, utilizing effective staff development procedures. These lists also included related evaluation responsibilities — e.g., providing leadership in the development of teaching performance standards and demonstrating ability to evaluate teaching performance.

All the job descriptions discuss, in one way or another, the supervision role of the principal. However, only one was so specific as to suggest responsibility akin to clinical supervision — e.g., demonstrating knowledge and application of various classroom supervision techniques appropriate to content areas, grade levels, and teaching styles.

In all cases, the principal's job descriptions reflect a range of activities which have nothing directly to do with curriculum, instruction, evaluation or staff development, such as budgeting, providing pupil personnel services, administering appropriate labor contracts, interpreting and enforcing all board-adopted policies, relating to parents and the community, managing the school plant, supervising non-certified personnel, purchasing, data collecting and management, keeping abreast of new professional developments, participating in district acitivities, and "...performing other related duties assigned by the Superintendent." No wonder most principals have insufficient time available for the adequate supervision of instruction.

Similarly, the National School Boards Association model description lists 50 responsibilities. It, too, covers a wide range of duties, several of which focus upon curricular and instructional matters. One item in the list states that "the principal supervises the school's educational program." However, no item specifically states that the principal should directly supervise classroom instruction. How the educational program is supervised is a matter left to local conditions and authority.

According to a recent study, teachers are more willing to follow principals viewed as competent in a range of duties and as having

desirable personal qualities.

Teacher satisfaction and school climate are clearly better in schools where principal leadership is also seen more positively by teachers. A number of other locally-determined variables such as school size, expenditures per pupil and congruence between perceived and actual goals of the school also influence teacher satisfaction. Study data show that teachers in more satisfying schools see their principals as autonomous in their own right, as treating the staff like colleagues and professionals, and as consistent in their dealings with other people.

The question that must be asked, of course, is whether teacher satisfaction and school climate make any particular difference in schooling. Studies outside of education are mixed. Some show worker productivity higher when there is high satisfaction and some show it lower. However, linkages *have* been established between teacher satisfaction and student satisfaction, and some studies have connected student satisfaction and student achievement.

A number of educational reform reports call for the principal to spend more time in instructional supervision. The job descriptions suggest that this would be very difficult for most principals to do.

Given the many demands currently placed upon the time of principals, it seems unrealistic to assume that they will be able to greatly increase their participation in direct classroom supervision. This fact, added to the research which confirms that individual characteristics of principals vary, that different school contexts call for different leadership styles, and that team efforts get better school improvement results, suggests that we need to develop far more comprehensive instructional supervision strategies, such as:

- the realistic definition of the role of principals in instructional improvement;
- the development of structural arrangements at the school level which support strong programs of instructional supervision as an integral part of school improvement efforts;
- new types of training for principals and others involved in supervision activities; and
- policy options for local boards of education which support strong school site improvement efforts, including counteracting any state mandates which mitigate against local reform efforts.

The various tasks in job descriptions must be carried out at each school. The emphasis will vary according to each situation and according to how responsibilities are distributed among staff members. However, one thing is clear: principals are responsible for seeing that everything gets done.

With regard to the instructional program, the principal must see that several specific things are accomplished. First, she or he is responsible for implementing a well-articulated, balanced curriculum which serves the needs of all of the students of the school. Such a curriculum includes not only the so-called basics and academics, but also a variety of experiences in the practical and fine arts for all students. Development of such a curriculum includes procedures for program evaluation and revision. Self-study must become a way of life.

The principal is also responsible for seeing that there is good instruction in each classroom, as described in the previous chapters. This means assuring good teaching skills. It also means the establishment of a system in helping supervision such as cognitive coaching and peer observation. Plus, it means having a fair set of evaluation procedures, ones which are clearly distinguished from those of helping supervision.

To ensure a balanced curriculum and to develop appropriate instructional practices, a principal has to see that adequate staff development programs are available to faculty members. This is critical to school improvement.

Two things currently stand in the way of building good school-based staff development programs: the isolation of teachers and the lack of staff development programs.

We must provide the time for adequate building-level staff development programs, ones which have been identified as important to the improvement of the school program. Ironically, the recent lengthening of the school day and school year has made it even more difficult to find time for staff development. This is an example of how well-intentioned state mandates can actually be a deterrent to school improvement, particularly when they are hurriedly decided upon and are based upon the oversimplification of complex research findings. (In this case, the "time-on-task" studies which address the issue of quality of classroom time and do *not* necessarily recommend longer school days and/or years.)

The principal must also be the climate leader at the school. That is, she or he must know how to motivate people, involve them appropriately in decision-making and other activity (e.g., peer supervision), and bring people together to overcome institutional isolation. The principal has the responsibility to keep abreast of new developments in schooling and to create linkages between the school and that new knowledge.

In short, the principal is responsible for setting a norm of intellectual curiosity at the school.

To achieve instructional improvement at the school, the principal

has to be able to communicate clearly with a variety of groups and individuals. Teacher satisfaction is greater in schools where the principal acts as the spokesperson for the school, representing the school's program and faculty with parents, community, district administration, and board of education. Likewise, the principal needs to be able to articulate wishes and policies of parents and the district leadership to the school staff.

Clearly, we need new structural arrangements at the school level if better programs of instructional supervision are to be developed. The typical response to this statement is that the principal should be relieved of many of the administrative duties which currently go with the job. According to this line of thinking, there will then be more time for the principal to supervise. Not necessarily.

Certainly the principal should somehow be relieved of much "administrivia." Assistants, interns, office managers, and other can take on a variety of managerial tasks leaving the principal free to provide intellectual leadership, seeing to a balanced curriculum, systems of supervision and evaluation, staff development, communication and the like. However, the principal may or may not be the right person to do the actual supervision. There are problems of status, skill, situation, and even disposition which need to be taken into account. The principal must see that a good system of helping supervision is in place — whether or not he or she actually does the supervision or delegates it to others.

Prior to the property tax cutting Proposition 13 in California, many school districts had cadres of very fine curriculum specialists available to assist teachers. Now that funds for school improvement are again available, state officials might be well advised to allow districts to design their own local improvement programs, including the employment of people to assist with helping supervision.

A California county office of education is about to try a truly innovative improvement strategy. As is the case with many county offices, this one employs many outstanding consultants. The strategy to be tried is simple. Consultants are to be assigned to schools rather than to workshops or projects. Such possibilities for interesting school improvement programs are numerous and depend upon the leadership of principals and the development of modest guidelines by the county department in question.

In addition to peer-coaching described in the previous chapter, mentors, department heads, and various specialists can be utilized in a variety of ways to assist in the instructional improvement process. The principal then must see that the school is organized so that everyone can make a maximum contribution to this process.

Another structure which is beginning to get some attention is a two-tiered system of teaching. There are many possible configurations of such a system. One comes from Westland School, a private school in Los Angeles. At Westland, a group teacher and co-teacher are assigned to each primary class. Each upper grade class has a group teacher and shares a co-teacher with another class. Group teachers are experienced, outstanding teachers. Co-teachers are either beginners or people returning to teaching after some time off.

Duties and salaries are differentiated. The group teacher is clearly "in charge." However, the co-teacher is more than an assistant. Planning, counseling, conferencing, teaching and evaluation are often joint activities. Sometimes the lead is taken by one or the other of the team because of strength or preference.

Advantages of this system are numerous. Beyond the obvious fact of having two observations, opinions, sets of skills and the like, the isolation which accompanies the usual teaching circumstances is minimized. The sharing of feedback on teaching becomes standard procedure. Co-teachers particularly benefit from learning from the more experienced group teachers. Also, there is great flexibility. With a team such as this, one member can take time to visit in another classroom or school. The two-tier system really supports staff development and instructional improvement efforts.

There should be new types of training programs for those aspiring to become principals and for those principals and others in schools who will supervise instruction. At both the pre-service and in-service levels, the conducting of the clinical supervision cycle is one critical set of skills to be mastered. Such training should be experience-based and should clearly be distinguished from clinical teaching.

Although the new preliminary administrative services credential requirements in California somewhat standardize the content of the pre-service training of potential administrators, higher education institutions have some leeway in what they can emphasize in their programs. In the recent past, it has been popular to emphasize curriculum leadership, clinical supervision skills, human relations abilities which lead to the development of a positive school climate, and the politics of education including school-community relations.

Offering school districts guaranteed performance programs for the training of entry-level administrators is the way colleges and school districts can participate together in the training. That is, if a district will identify a cadre of potential administrators, the college will:

- design an appropriate preliminary administrative services credential for the group,
- train them, and

- carry out on-the-job follow up with each person to assure his or her satisfactory performance.

Such a program gives the district a major voice in who is trained and how. For the individual candidate, the continuity between pre-service training and the initial years on the job overcomes the current randomness of entry level administrative training.

While many new building level administrators will be needed in the next two decades, the greatest number of instructional leaders will be those who are already employed and/or trained as administrators. Thus, the design of good in-service training for supervisors of instruction, including incumbent principals, seems critical.

Obviously, the areas which should be emphasized in the pre-service training of principals are the same ones which should be emphasized in programs of in-service training: curriculum leadership, supervision of instruction, human relations, and politics of education. However, there are critical differences between the two kinds of training. Principals and other supervisors of instruction have a great deal of experience and prior training. Therefore, the skills they need to develop vary considerably. As an initial step, these training needs should be assessed so that individualized in-service activities can be sought and/or designed. In this regard, there are good models in operation. Both California State University, Fullerton and the San Diego Department of Education have well-functioning administrator assessment centers.

Implementing assessment programs as an initial step in creating in-service opportunities is a fairly easy task. More difficult is to create in-service programs that are school-based, ones which adequately link theory and practice and which cause supervisors to practice the necessary skills. The typical model of in-service calls for people to go somewhere away from their schools and to learn a set of skills. The assumption is that those skills are then practiced at the schools. They may not be. A better model is to have the skills taught in a workshop setting, then practiced at the schools, and then have this practice evaluated either in a subsequent workshop or at the school.

An even better model of in-service would be entirely school-based. Given the goal of encouraging peer supervision, given the desire for everyone to understand the value of helping supervision, and given the need to overcome teacher isolation, it seems wise to suggest that every faculty member at every school learn what helping supervision is and how it works best.

Some principals may be resistant to these efforts. Districts which legitimatize and even reward progress toward collegial learning can ease the transition. Certainly, they must protect principals from the

current rhetoric which equates accountability with being autocratic. Rather, encouraging broad faculty participation and development will produce the desired results.

Such school-based models suggest new ways of operation for county offices of education, school district staff development offices, and agencies such as California's Administrator Training Centers. Rather than determining the contents of in-service training and then designing workshops for individuals to attend, such agencies must respond to the needs of individual schools and develop programs which are carried out at those schools.

Chapter 7: The Role of the School Board: Linking the Professional and Political Worlds of Clinical Supervision

by Richard C. Williams

"I believe the intellectual life of the whole of western society is increasingly being split into two polar groups.

"Literary intellectuals at one pole — at the other, scientists, and as the most representative, the physical scientists. Between the two a gulf of mutual incomprehension — sometimes (particularly among the young) hositility and dislike, but most of all lack of understanding. They have a curious distorted image of each other."

Thus did C.P. Snow state the main thesis of his celebrated essay, "The Two Cultures." Snow was a noted professional scientist by day; in the evenings he was a well-known writer and member of English literary society. Living in both the world of science and the world of letters he could see the gap that existed betwen these two worlds and how each suffered from not knowing more about the other. His conclusion was that each would be enriched by a closer linkage with the other.

While my world is quite different from C.P. Snow's, I share one common characteristic: I too divide my time between two worlds. During the day I work as a professor in UCLA's Graduate School of Education where I teach graduate courses to aspiring school administrators. In the evenings I shed my academic robes and serve as a member of a local school board. In these two related, but in some ways uniquely separate, activities is the gap between the professional world of clinical supervision and the political world of clinical supervision. Despite the differences between the two worlds, a closer linkage between the two is necessary. School district policy is that link. By taking some preliminary steps, school districts can develop an effective clinical supervision program.

The Professional World

Since the initial work of Harvard's Morris Cogan, the field of clinical

supervision has come a long way. Educational leaders such as Madeline Hunter, Robert Goldhammer, Robert Anderson and Art Costa have added to and enriched our knowledge of ways in which teachers can be effectively supervised. Older and more conventional teacher supervision practices were typified by the school principal entering the teacher's classroom, looking around, sitting for a while at the back of the classroom, and then making oftentimes vague comments about the room's neatness, the students' behavior, the teacher's appearance and the lesson's appropriateness. Now, clinical supervision has developed a more comprehensive repertoire, a common language, and an approach that has potential for helping realize Cogan's definition of teaching as a true profession.

Under this "professional"model, teacher supervision should be non-punitive; teachers should be involved in peer-coaching; effective evaluation of teachers should include understanding the teachers' situation, the teachers' goals and the teachers' assumptions about the approaches they are using. Only then can a supervisor make any meaningful progress in helping a teacher improve.

The Political World

As a school board member, however, I am confronted by another reality: namely, the public's interest in its schools and concern that those who teach its children are competent to do so. The public expects that school boards and state lawmakers, who are charged with enforcing those policies, will establish norms and procedures for teacher competency and subsequently enforce them.

For the most part these expectations are realized. Most teachers are competent, hard working and caring. Indeed, given the level of pay and the increasing difficulty of the task it is sometimes amazing that so many really talented people remain in the profession. The public is indebted to them. Competent teachers generally welcome inquiries into their work because they are confident in their abilities and they realize that everyone, no matter how skilled, must continue to grow and expand if they are to remain vital. They recognize that personal fulfillment comes from challenge and inquiry.

However, teaching, like all occupations and professions, has amongst its ranks those few who are either incompetent or who need considerable help if they are to rise to acceptable professional standards. In some instances the problems may be episodic; that is, the teacher is going through a period of personal or professional difficulty. In other instances, the problem may result from inadequate teaching skills.

It is often difficult to identify and improve incompetent teachers, or to remove them from the classroom if they do not improve.

Efforts to remove incompetent teachers, when undertaken, often result in an enormous investment of time and money in classroom visits, adversarial proceedings, lawyers' fees and emotional stress. And seldom does this investment result in a reluctant teacher either improving or being removed from the classroom. Unfortunately, a common retort to a school board member's inquiries about a specific teacher's alleged incompetency is, "Well, you might be right, but there is very little we can do about it."

Another problem is that the professional clinical supervision literature ignores such school board realities as teacher unions and district contracts. Yet teacher unions, with their legitimate concerns about working conditions, have a great organizational stake in how teachers are supervised and judged competent. Consequently school district employment contracts carry numerous provisions that have profound effects on how clinical supervision can be conducted in school districts.

Similarly, in the political school literature one finds precious little about clinical supervision, the strides that have been made in improving it, and the assumptions and practices that are integral parts of that approach.

Can these two "worlds" be reconciled? Can we adhere to the important professional fundamentals of clinical supervision while at the same time satisfying the public's need for accountability?

Linking The Two Worlds

Educational history reveals many legislative attempts to assure that the quality of public school teachers meets public expectations. Recent passage of California's major education reform legislation, SB 813, with its provisions that administrators will have demonstrated skills in clinical supervision is one approach; another has been the passage of the legislation that instituted minimal competence requirements for teachers and substitute teachers.

Perhaps the most comprehensive approach, and the one that most directly attempted to link teacher supervision with the political calls for teacher accountability, was California's Stull Act, which was passed in 1972. Briefly stated, the Act required that all teachers, both probationary and tenured, would have their classroom performance evaluated at regular intervals. Based essentially on a Management-By-Objectives approach to teacher supervision, it required each district to develop and submit to the state a plan by which district administrators would evaluate teacher performance based on the degree to which teachers were able to achieve agreed-upon student growth goals in their classrooms. The approach was originally intended to identify teachers who needed to improve their skills. Once identified, those

teachers were to be given in-service training to bring their skills up to an acceptable level. If the teacher could not meet those expectations, steps were to be taken to remove the teacher from the district's employment.

While intended to be supportive of teachers, research underway indicates that the Stull Act has not fulfilled it's author's intentions.

Why?

Perhaps the answer lies in its hierarchical and punitive aspects. The Stull Act places the responsibility for teacher supervision solely in administrators' hands. It assumes that the wisdom for teacher improvement rests legally and professionally with administrators. Teachers are merely the objects to be improved.

Teachers and their organizations considered it hostile legislation, and it was easily undermined. There simply were not enough administrators to conduct all the in-depth supervision that the Act required. What is more, the adminsitrators lacked commonly accepted techniques for teacher evaluation that would withstand legal challenges in courts of law. The Act's provisions have, in many districts, evolved into a meaningless ritual. Many teachers and administrators today find the process to be a hollow shell of what was intended by the legislature. There are simply not the means, time, or technical skills to do it any differently. The law failed to address the complexities of professional teacher supervision in a political world of teacher practice.

What, then, will bridge this professional/political gap?

Specifically, a professional approach to teacher supervision which fits into the political and professional worlds must include these elements:

1. Teachers must be involved at all stages in developing the procedure to be used in a district. This element recognizes several factors. It assumes that teachers, as professionals, share the public's concern for teaching excellence. It recognizes the political reality of teacher supervision: namely, if teachers do not believe that the system is fair or do not feel "ownership" for it, they can easily sabotage it. Involving teachers in developing the system will not, in itself, guarantee teacher enthusiasm or participation, but it will at least greatly minimize the adversarial element.

2. The system must provide for multiple sources of teacher appraisal, and it must separate, but link, supervision and evaulation. More than one person should be involved in the evaulation/supervision process, and the two processes may not best be carried out by one person. This will help reduce the potential for conflict when administrators concurrently supervise and evaluate teachers.

3. The system should recognize and accommodate different teaching approaches and styles. There is more than one way to teach effectively.

4. The system must provide a clear, unambiguous picture of the teacher's inadequacies and it must provide a means for remediation.

5. The system, once devised with all the safeguards and conditions listed above, must *require* teacher compliance and improvement. However, it must provide for optional ways in which the teacher can improve, e.g., guided practice, workshops, inter-classroom visitations, master teacher consultants.

6. The plan must carry consequences for non-compliance or non-improvement, such as financial penalties or dismissal.

These elements reflect the requirements of both the professional and political worlds.

On the professional side, they recognize both that teachers have a great amount of expertise and that they share the concerns school administrators and the public have about ensuring consistently high quality classroom teaching. It recognizes that there are acceptable and multiple approaches to teaching and clinical supervision.

On the political side, it recognizes that the teacher should be given sufficient indications about shortcomings, and the help to improve. But if he or she refuses to participate or cannot improve, the public interest demands that the teacher no longer practice in the classroom.

What might a school board do to move in this direction? Boards could:

1. Learn about the district's current teacher evaluation system. What are its main features? How effective is it in identifying teachers who are below district expectations and providing them with appropriate help? How successful is it in effecting teacher improvement and allowing the district to counsel or dismiss those who do not meet district standards?

2. Acquaint themselves with districts which have already made headway in developing such systems, for example the plan now being used in Toledo, Ohio that was described in the issue of the American School Boards Journal.

3. Begin discussions with the teachers' union about working together to develop a system that bridges the professional and political worlds of clinical supervision; a system that recognizes your shared desire that the teachers in the district's classrooms are competent. These discussions will only proceed successfully if you make it clear that you recognize that teachers and their organizations have a legitimate interest in assuring both that the district's teachers are competent and that any system developed respects the teachers'

needs for fairness and due process.

4. Develop jointly with the teachers a district approach to clinical supervision that makes sense to your district. This task will likely take considerable time to complete, but you can draw upon successful existing models for inspiration.

5. Provide the means to accomplish the task. This means an investment of money and time. You cannot expect teachers to work with you in developing such a plan on their own time. So it may indeed cost in-service time and extra pay to assure that the teachers have the time and energy to really work with you in developing the plan.

6. Once the plan is in place and operating, establish a regular and systematic way to evaluate its workability. Here you should be asking the same questions you asked about your previous system. Be prepared to make changes in the program, even abandon the plan, if it is not achieving the desired goals.

Given the heavy responsibilities that school boards face in just meeting day-to-day demands, and given the adversarial relationship that has sometimes developed between boards and teacher organizations, it is likely that many board member readers will simply throw up their hands and say "sounds good, but we cannot do it." To those I would say, "What could be more important to your district?" The quality of teachers in your classrooms is one of the most vital elements in an effective school district. Given the improvements in clinical supervision described and discussed in this booklet, it appears that the professional world of effective supervision is making real progress. Those of us who serve on school boards represent the political world on the issue. And the initiative for making sure that the political side is also represented in teacher evaluation rests to a major degree with us. But that is not enough. We must also work with school administrators and teachers in an effort to see that the gap of misunderstanding between these two worlds is narrowed. As elected public trustees of our schools, there is no more important task for us to perform.

Conclusion

Moving to school-based improvement strategies such as those described in this booklet will not be easy in today's schools. Old habits are hard to break. The notion that the principal represents authority and that she or he will reward or punish according to some set of arbitrary criteria is one that will not die easily. Also, until the distinction between supervision and evaluation is clear, a lack of trust and even adversarial relationships between teachers and administrators will continue.

Instead of making sure school people do things in certain ways, the desired results can be achieved by encouraging them to experiment, be creative and join in collegial improvement efforts at the building level. The implication that, if you don't measure up (test scores), you will be punished, is hardly conducive to trust building.

Often well-meaning state legislators and education officials are pushing hard for statewide standards of excellence through a constant stream of legislation, statewide policies and guidelines. However, in the process they are killing local initiative and creativity. Worse, the drive for standardization flies in the face of recommendations from the recent major research studies on schooling, including much of the school effectiveness research which officials tend to draw upon, albeit only selectively. This posture should be totally reversed. State officials should be enabling, encouraging and supporting local initiative rather than directing local activity from afar, in the name of standards.

Local policy makers can do much to support, encourage and bring about site level school improvement. The following suggestions for board members summarizes the guidelines in this booklet. While each is important in its own right, they are collectively offered as a comprehensive change strategy for local school districts.

- Accept the principle that the school is the critical unit in the improvement process. With that principle clearly in mind it becomes obvious that the role of the district and other agencies is to enable, encourage and support innovation, not to direct it.
- Don't fall into the trap of looking for and/or adopting panaceas or "quick fixes." There are many good "models" of teaching. Anyone who believes he or she has the one best model is deluding himself or herself. Some basic characteristics of schools will have to undergo examination if we truly want change, such things as the isolation of teachers and the controlling nature of schooling.
- At the heart of the matter of supervision is the need to clarify the

operational differences between the supervision and the evaluation of teaching. Questions such as who is responsible for each and what the differences in purposes are for each are important for districts to answer *prior* to the development of plans for supervision or evaluation of teaching.

- There are many models of instructional supervision. This booklet emphasizes the importance of adopting or developing one which is consistent with the way in which adults learn, produces development of trust and autonomous behavior and focuses on teacher *thinking*.
- If the research is correct, the principal is the critical person in the school improvement process. Therefore, it seems logical to invest heavily in the development of principal leadership abilities. Such development should take into account individual differences among principals as well as among the schools in which they serve. Also, such development should be broad rather than narrow. Learning to observe to assure that teachers implement the various steps of critical teaching is worthwhile, but such learning by itself does not make a person an instructional leader. Rather, we need principals who can provide curriculum leadership, supervise instruction, motivate and involve faculty members in appropriate decision-making and activities and communicate well with a variety of significant others.
- Given the many things principals are expected to do, it is unrealistic to assume that they are going to be able to take on most of the burden of instructional supervision in their schools. Other people must also be involved and trained. Peer coaching — teachers helping each other — seems a worthwhile strategy to consider. Not only does it hold promise as a supervision technique, but it also addresses issues such as overcoming teacher isolation, building trust, developing autonomy and breaking down of the control orientation of schooling.
- Crucial to the success of the plan of helping supervision is the involvement of teachers from the beginning. This includes agreements with the teachers' union and adequate teacher representation in the planning stages. Additionally, it means providing adequate resources for teacher release time and other expenses so participation in planning and in the actual supervision process is indeed possible.
- The pressure for statewide standardization of schooling is very strong. To promote school-based improvement efforts involving helping supervision, boards of education and district administrators may be forced to find ways to minimize the impact of some state mandates upon creative local school initiatives. By law, education is a state function and local boards of education are extensions of state government. However, the political reality is that those who govern do

so with the consent of the governed. Local authorities can and should assert themselves about what is good educational policy and practice. Further, local authorities have the responsibility to view "guidelines" as just that and not as mandates. Thus, they can and should feel free to adapt or even reject such guidelines when it seems appropriate. Most important, local authorities should assert themselves both with those who make law and policy and with those whom they serve. Educating the public about state educational policy, in itself, can go a long way toward fostering public support for local school improvement efforts.

We find ourselves in an interesting and important transition period in public education. Some people are even questioning its very existence. Others are studying various aspects of it. Almost everyone believes it should be reformed. What the reforms should be and how they should be brought about are hotly debated issues. And they should be debated, particularly if out of the process come structures and procedures which involve the greatest possible number of people in the reform.

The issues surrounding instructional supervision are critical to this invovlement and to the reform process in general. This booklet attempts to help local school board members and practitioners with those issues.

Bibliography

1. Ernest L. Boyer. *High School.* New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

2. Ron Brandt. "On Improving Teacher Effectiveness: A Conversation with David Berliner," *Educational Leadership,* 40: 12-15, October, 1982.

3. Morris Cogan. *Clinical Supervision.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

4. Arthur L. Costa. *Supervision for Intelligent Teaching.* Orangevale, CA: Search Models Unlimited, 1984.

5. David Crandall. "The Teacher's Role in School Improvement," *Educational Leadership,* 41: 6-9, November, 1983.

6. Wayne De Bevoise. "Synthesis of Research on the Principal As Instructional Leader," *Educational Leadership,* 41: 14-20, February, 1984.

7. Carl D. Glickman. *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental*

Approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1985.

8. Robert Goldhammer, Robert H. Anderson, and Robert J. Krajewski. *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

9. Madeline Hunter. "What's Wrong With Madeline Hunter," *Educational Leadership,* 42: 57-60, February, 1985.

10. Bruce Joyce, et. al. *ISTE Report II: Interviews, Perceptions of Professionals and Policy Makers.* Palo Alto: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.

11. Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller: *Teachers, Their World, and Their Work.* Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Kathleen McCormick, *This Union-Backed Program is Ridding Toledo Schools of Incompetent Teachers,* Amer. School Board Journal, July 1985, pp. 19-22.

13. Frederick J. McDonald and Patricia Elias. *Beginning Teaching Evaluation Study, Phase II.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Services, 1976.

14. National School Boards Association. *School Personnel Management System.* Alexandria, Va.: National School Boards Association, 1982.

15. Seymour Sarason. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982.

16. Thomas J. Sergiovanni. *Supervision of Teaching.* Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

17. _____and Robert J. Starratt. *Supervision: Human Perspective* (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1983.

18. Theodore Sizer. *Horace's Compromise.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

19. A number of publications which resulted from A Study of Schooling are relevant to this topic. Most important, we believe, are:

Gerald A. Engstrom. *An Examination of The Viability of Class Climate As A Useful Construct in Secondary Schools.* Study of Schooling Technical Report No. 23. Arlington, Va.: Eric Document Center, 1981.

John I. Goodlad. *A Place Called School.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Monica B. Morris. *The Public School As Workplace: The Principal As A Key Element In Teacher Satisfaction.* Study of Schooling Report No. 32. Arlington, Va.: Eric Document Center, 1981.

Barbara Benham Tye. *Multiple Realities: A Study of Thirteen American High Schools.* Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985.

Kenneth A. Tye. *Changing Our Schools: The Realities.* Study of Schooling Report No. 32. Arlington, Va.: Eric Document Center, 1981.

_____ *The Junior High: School in Search of A Mission.* Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985.

Notes

Published by the
California School Boards Association
March, 1986

California School Boards Association
916 23rd Street • Sacramento, CA 95816